Reposing public confidence in Unani System of treatment

†1422. SHRI MUNAVVAR HASAN: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) the cost of medicines supplied to various C.G.H.S. dispensaries during the last three years;

(b) the cost of medicines provided to C.G.H.S beneficiaries;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Director (Unani) has failed in reposing people's confidence in the Unani System of Medicines;

(d) if so, the details thereof; and

(e) the steps being taken by Government to repose public confidence in the Unani System of Medicines?

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (DR. C.P. THAKUR): (a) and (b) The information relating to expenditure incurred by CGHS during the last three years for procurement of medicines through the Govt. Medical Store Depot and through local purchase is given at Statement. *(See* below)

(c) to (e) No, Sir. There is no post designated as Director (Unani) in the Deptt. of Indian System of Medicine and Homoeopathy. However, there is a post of Deputy Advisor (Unani) and the Government is making all efforts for promotion of Unani system of Medicine.

Statement

Expenditure on medicines purchased through G.M.S.D. and local purchase for the last three years.

Rupees in Thousand

S. No.	Year	Through GMSD	Through Local Purchase	Total
		Ahmedabad		
1.	1998-1999	1.97	56.61	58.59
2	1999-2000	5.82	54.12	5 .95
3.	2000-2001	2.97	81.94	84.91

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

S. No.	Year	Through GMGD	Through Local Purchase	Total
		Allahabad		
1.	1998-1999	50.00	1,15.02	1,65,02
2	1999-2000	27.00	2,69,56	1,77,86
3.	2000-2001	40.00	1,95,95	2^5,95
		Bangalore		
1.	1998-1999	8520	1.59.49	2,44,69
2	1999-2000	12.75	2,6936	28231
3.	2000-2001	29,19	2,67,85	2,97,04
		Bhubaneswar		
1.	1998-1999	1219	20.12	3231
2	1999-2000	1*1	30,00	31.81
3.	2000-2001	2,62	33,97	36,50
		Chennai		
1.	1998-1999	91.69	2.59,61	3,51,30
2	1999-2000	83.00	238,56	32136
3.	2000-2001	59,62	3,66,07	43,69
		Guwahati		
1.	1998-1999	5,17	29.85	35.02
2	1999-2000	—	59.99	59.99
3.	2000-2001	46	1.04,84	1,0530
		Hyderabad		
1.	1998-1999	13,12	5,56,47	6,9539
2	1999-2000	2,66,32	10,65,28	1331,60
3.	2000-2001	94,95	13,55,49	14.50,44
		Jaipur		
1.	1998-1999	103	1,103	13,46
2	1999-2000	24,70	74,93	99,63
3.	2000-2001	14,12	1,70,94	1,85,06

S. No.	Year	Through GMGD	Through Local Purchase	Total
		Jabalpur		
1.	1998-1999	31,91	6827	1,00,18
2	1999-2000	4.00	67.86	71.86
3.	2000-2001	12.61	1,6939	1,82,00
		Kanpur		
1.	1998-1999	1,64,03	1,47,61	3,11,64
2	1999-2000	42,42	224,96	2,6739
3.	2000-2001	96,72	335.46	432,18
		Kolkata		
1.	1998-1999	1,88,72	2,01,04	3,89,76
2	1999-2000	84,08	3,64,60	4,48,68
3.	2000-2001	78,65	4,71,20	5,49,85
		Lucknow		-
1.	1998-1999	65.63	94.93	1,60,55
2	1999-2000	38.00	1,2130	1,5930
3.	2000-2001	3939	1,29,66	1,69.05
		Meenit		
1.	1998-1999	19.41	1,863	2,05,68
2	1999-2000	7525	2,02,90	2,78,15
3.	2000-2001	20.70	2,49,13	2,69,83
		Mumbai		
1.	1998-1999	12439	2.73,54	3.97,93
2	1999-2000	4937	4,2433	4,73.70
3.	2000-2001	26,90	2^5,41	2^231
		Nagpur		
1.	1998-1999	45.10	2.14,92	2.60,02
2	1999-2000	15.99	2,69,98	2,85,97
3.	2000-2001	18,56	3,25,18	3,43,74

S. No.	Year	Through GMGD	Through Local Purchase	Total
			Patna	
1.	1998-1999	47.18	76.68	113.86
2	1999-2000	1228	103.45	115.74
3.	2000-2001	31.79	12234	154.13
			Pune	
1.	1998-1999	67.70	134.49	202.19
2	1999-2000	17.98	22236	24034
3.	2000-2001	520	288.59	293.79
			Ranchi	
1.	1998-1999	6.83	84.95	91.78
2	1999-2000	86	9534	9620
3.	2000-2001	1.59	110.09	111.68
			Trivandrum	
1.	1998-1999	19.60	38.48	58.09
2	1999-2000	1.51	56.45	57.%
3.	2000-2001	13.59	96.83	110.42

Delhi

S.No.	YEAR	ALLOPATHIC	AYURVEDIC	HOMOEPATHIC	UNANI
1.	1998-1999	4137.41	199.04	43.18	34.06
2	1999-2000	4928.89	175.66	4224	30.09
3.	2000-2001	5959.60	254.07	55.71	38.10

Targets for Family Welfare Programmes

1423. SHRI SURESH PACHOURI: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have stopped the practice of setting targets for important family welfare programmes;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) how Government propose to improve performance of family welfare programmes, especially in BIMARU States?